

STATE LAND USE PLANNING ADVISORY COUNCIL

Minutes

March 17th, 2006

Meeting Location

*Department of Conservation & Natural Resources
Bryan Building
901 South Stewart Street
Carson City, Nevada*

Members Present (ten)

Roger Mancebo, Pershing County-Chair
Juan Guzman/Pete Livermore for Carson City
Glenn Bunch for Mineral County
Chuck Pulsipher for Clark County
Bill Whitney, Washoe County
Mickey Yarbrow, Lander County
Michael Mears, Eureka County
Robert Conner, Douglas County
Sheri Eklund-Brown, Elko County
Varlin Higbee, Lincoln County

Members Absent (seven)

Lyon County- Don Tibbals
Churchill County- Gwen Washburn
Esmeralda County- Nancy Boland
Humboldt County- Gary Bengochea
Storey County- Robert Kershaw
Nye County (vacant)
White Pine County (vacant)

Others Present

Pamela Wilcox, NV Division of State Lands
Jim Lawrence, NV Division of State Lands
Clinton Wertz, NV Division of State Lands
Terri Harber, Nevada Appeal
Jim Petell, Town of Pahrump
Larry Becker, Pahrump Town Board

CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Mancebo called the meeting to order at 8:00 am.

Self-introductions were made by all audience and council members present.

Prior to approving the draft minutes for the October 14th, 2005 SLUPAC meeting, **Chair Mancebo** asked if there were any proposed changes or comments. None were brought and **Mickey Yarbrow** moved to approve the minutes and **Michael Mears** seconded the vote. All approved with **Varlin Higbee** of Lincoln County abstaining.

AGENCY REPORT

Pamela Wilcox, Administrator of the Division of State Lands welcomed members to the Bryan Building. She described how many dispersed state offices had been combined into the new facility and that the building was developed as a lease-purchase option which required the legislature to change laws related to such a venture. She further explained that a sister building would occupy the lot to the east once its funding was approved by the legislature at a future session. **Ms. Wilcox** thanked all those present for attending.

Clint Wertz, Senior Planner, presented an update on planning assistance in Rural Nevada. He also explained that members have asked for an overview of SLUPAC and its function so he was going to provide an overview of what SLUPAC has accomplished in the past and what statute allows.

Mr. Wertz started by explaining the statutory role of SLUPAC as created in 1975. The State Land Use Planning Advisory Council has two main roles. The primary role is to advise the administrator of state lands and the governor's office of local land use planning needs and issues statewide. The secondary role which is used less often is to use the council as a forum to mediate and recommend options for site specific conflicts that arise from two or more jurisdictions. Within this category SLUPAC has adopted model ordinances in the past and created ACEC's (Areas of Critical Environmental Concern) for sensitive resource sites impacted by non-compatible land uses. **Ms. Wilcox** added that whenever one or more jurisdictions would request assistance on a conflict between two or more issues she would direct the executive council of SLUPAC to address the issue with staff assistance from State Lands.

Mr. Wertz summarized his recent planning assistance projects. SLUPAC has been assisting in local planning efforts in Lincoln County, Elko County, Pershing County, Carson City and others on smaller requests. He stated the office has been very busy with requests.

Mr. Wertz went on to describe other planning projects. These included updating the Planning Directory and the popular Laws Related to Planning. The latter document is being overhauled this year to improve on formatting and usability of the publication. The books should be available shortly. He asked the group for any recommendations to the publications. **Mr. Pulsipher** of Clark County requested adding NRS 118 B the section that deals with mobile home parks.

Mr. Wertz concluded by suggesting the board nominate a new executive council since the past executive council terms had expired. He explained the purpose of first explaining what the role of an executive member before having any SLUPAC members willing to commit to the post.

Discussion ensued on a variety of issues that had been presented. **Mr. Pulsipher** inquired as to the funding ratio of SNPLMA funds from county land bills to be used locally. **Ms. Wilcox** stated that 85% of funds were determined eligible for conservation projects on federal lands. A lesser

amount went towards the state school trust fund (5%) and other research projects related to the bill (10% to Southern Nevada Water Association.) **Mr. Pulsipher** asked if there was concern about the loss of these funds in future land sales. **Ms. Wilcox** replied that the money appeared safe for the time being.

She then inquired with SLUPAC members on other county land bills. Members Yarbrow, Whitney, Conner, Mancebo and Livermore all responded they were at various points with their counties on such land bills. **Mr. Whitney** then inquired about the process of how lands are actually disposed of by BLM. **Ms. Wilcox** explained that once lands are identified for disposal for local governments, BLM holds a public auction for the lands and that private bidders typically have an advantage over public bodies in such auctions.

Mickey Yarbrow asked about the mediation role of SLUPAC. **Ms. Wilcox** said that one of two bodies must request assistance to trigger the official request. **Mr. Mancebo** commented that he saw potential in the future for this role to be utilized.

Mr. Yarbrow continued the discussion by re-nominating **Mr. Mancebo** as the chairman, **Mr. Whitney** seconded the motion. **Mr. Whitney** was then nominated by **Robert Conner** for the position of Vice Chair and **Robert Conner** seconded the motion. A motion for both positions were then affirmed by all members by vote.

Ms. Wilcox explained that the executive council was comprised of the chair and vice chair and two additional members plus two alternates. The members then voted to include **Varlin Higbee** and **Robert Conner** as the 2 additional executive council members with **Michael Mears** and **Chuck Pulsipher** as alternates.

Jim Lawrence, Deputy Administrator for the Division of State Lands then mentioned his recent attendance in a Joint Military Affairs Committee meeting at Nellis AFB. He explained that the military commanders are likely to introduce legislation at the next session that would require additional planning requirements for counties and cities to follow. The primary concern of the military bases was their ability to continue their flight corridors unimpeded. The other major issue presented was the proposed Nevada over flight expansion of Hill AFB in Utah. Public hearings will be scheduled for the proposal in the future.

Mr. Yarbrow inquired on the history of JMAC. **Ms. Wilcox** stated that JMAC was created by The Congressional report entitled the "Special Nevada Report" in response to state and local concerns of military activities in Nevada and the lack of cooperation between the groups. It also arose in part from the closure of the popular Freedom Ridge BLM site in the 1980's near Rachel where people gathered to monitor activities at Groom Lake. Quarterly meetings are held to update state agencies on federal armed forces actions in Nevada. The meetings are closed to the public and are by invite only.

There had been poor communication and tepid relationships between the state and federal land managers over a variety of military operations that utilized airspace outside of bases. As a result one of the recommendations of the report was to increase communications between state and federal land managers through quarterly meetings now known as JMAC.

Questions arose about land use interaction of counties with military bases statewide. **Mr. Pulsipher** mentioned that Clark County has had long involvement with issues related to Nellis Air Force Base. He said that the county uses a "Nellis" zoning overlay and that all construction in these areas must meet sound standards and that all parcels have navigation easements attached to the deeds.

Mr. Higbee stated that the Alamo Town Board has had many discussions about military activities due to its unique proximity to the base. **Ms. Wilcox** stated that many ill-feelings about the military operations date back to the 1980's and the original MX missile proposal which would have had major land use implications for much of eastern Nevada.

Mr. Whitney inquired if counties could be more involved in SLUPAC. **Ms. Wilcox** stated that the JMAC meetings are closed to invitees but that SLUPAC would certainly be a good forum for discussion of those issues.

Sheri Eklund-Brown arrives at 8:50 am.

Mr. Robert Conner, the new member from Douglas County introduced himself to the group. He explained that he owns a small consulting firm and is the vice-chairman of the Douglas County Planning Commission. **Mr. Conner** was welcomed by the group.

A short recess occurred to allow for room setup for speakers.

CARSON CITY ENVISION MASTER PLAN UPDATE

Lee Plemel, Principal Planner, Carson City

Lee Plemel, Principal Planner from Carson City was introduced to the group by **Ms. Wilcox**. Also in the group were **Juan Guzman**, Open Space Manager and **Vern Krahn**, Park Planner from the city.

Mr. Plemel began his presentation by outlining the last city plan which was completed in 1996. He explained how many changes had occurred in the city since that date and that the master plan revision has been ongoing for about 2 years. The changes he listed included, the new Carson City Freeway, Lyon County Growth to the east, Douglas county growth to the south, and aging city population and its location as a crossroads of 395 and US Hwy 50.

The current master plan process will combine over 12 separate planning efforts for the first time into a single document. It will also integrate the plans for the first time in terms of related policies and action items. **Mr. Plemel** emphasized four main goals of the plan. They included implementing a new land use element to reflect the city's growth needs, planning for appropriate levels of infrastructure, create options for affordable housing and to revitalize the downtown.

For the planning effort the city had received 12 qualified RFQ's. After further review the list was whittled down to 2 consultants, Clarion and Associates and Winston. Throughout the process a

management team was create to work through the planning process with the consultants. A steering group was not selected for the master planning process but rather it was decided that one-on-one communication from the consultant team and county staff would be preferable.

Major stakeholders of the plan were the city, the state, chamber of commerce, builders association of western Nevada as well as tribal interests. Combined with the stakeholders there was an extensive outreach process used to get community buy-in to the plan. A website was developed specifically for postings documents and soliciting comments. Over 500 contacts were made on a regular basis to an email list. Public access TV was used for outreach and the public meetings were televised to the community.

Key concepts emerged from this outreach. They included;

- Use of smart growth techniques- mixed use development into under or poorly developed areas
- Consider the limitations of growth based on available water supplies
- Plan for growth in 20 years or build-out of 66 to 70K
- Infill growth instead of expansion into nearby public lands

Mr. Wertz inquired about the relationship between public lands policies and the master plan. **Mr. Plemel** replied that the focus has been on viewing public land primarily as open space. **Ms. Eklund-Brown** asked about adjacent US Forest Service lands for expansion. **Mr. Guzman** responded that there is limited opportunities. Much of the USFS land is higher elevation lands with a few scattered exceptions. He furthered by saying one current example of a USFS disposal is near Costco at Hwy 50.

Mr. Conner inquired about the recent specific area plan for Vicee Canyon. **Mr. Guzman** replied that while the SPA (specific planning area) proposal was supported by city staff as a natural growth area for residential and good planning, many neighbors protested the project. He further stated that the area was likely to be developed in the future due to its location and demand for housing in Carson City. In addition he said that there is a chance that the city may ask the legislature to change state laws to allow the area to remain in open space.

Ms. Wilcox replied that the state had spent considerable time in developing what it saw as a well balanced land use plan for the area. She continued by saying that the lands of the trust are an asset of the school trust and that she felt the city would have a difficult time changing state law to take away from the trusts primary purpose- to help fund K-12 public schools statewide. Since the land is held in trust by the state as given by the federal government upon statehood the issue of changing the purpose of the trust lands would be a constitutional one not a change in state law.

Mr. Plemel went on by saying that 5 themes emerged from the planning process. They included;

- Balanced land use
- Recreational opportunities
- Economic vitality
- Livable neighborhoods
- Improved connectivity for both pedestrians and vehicles

Several items were clearly spelled out in the master plan document according to **Mr. Plemel**.

- Discussion of statutory requirements for planning
- Section on property rights, takings and what constitutes and actual take of lands
- Differences between zoning and the master plan since many residents confuse the two

Mr. Whitney inquired about the conservation reserve district for Carson City. **Mr. Plemel** replied it was an area of private lands without current city services with low density development potential but with future higher density development potential if services were extended and other site specific concerns were met.

Mr. Plemel went on by saying these areas were candidates for the use of a specific plan area.

Mr. Guzman interjected that the SPA's are a good tool for directing measured growth into proper areas while maintaining and protecting other sensitive lands as open space. **Mr. Plemel** reiterated that it provides for known expectations for adjacent uses.

Lessons learned from the Envision Carson City process included the following;

- Engaging the public in many ways- created a sense of ownership for community
- Flexibility throughout the process enables the city to respond to and develop a better plan

Mr. Pulsipher inquired about how public notice was done. **Mr. Plemel** stated that a city wide mailing was not done but rather a buffer of 300 feet from proposed change areas. **Mr. Pulsipher** then asked about the affordable housing portion of the plan. Both **Mr. Plemel** and **Mr. Guzman** responded that options considered were, increased accessory dwellings, exclusionary zoning potential and taller buildings to maximize land base. **Mr. Pulsipher** asked if the city was considering future non-conforming zone changes in the future? **Mr. Plemel** felt there was reason to feel the city would not entertain such actions but rather follow the master plan. **Ms. Eklund-Brown** asked about any tribal expansions in a Carson City land bill. **Mr. Plemel** stated the city had inquired with the tribe and were awaiting a response. **Mr. Guzman** said that there was interest from the tribes in the continuation of a fire break trail along the Carson Colony boundary. **Mr. Krahm** further commented that he was surprised at the amount of recent interest from the tribes in terms of trails and recreation. He also said that the Bureau of Indian Affairs had offered a letter of support for tribal amenities.

Ms. Eklund-Brown inquired with the group about recent planning activities in the Spring Creek area southeast of Elko. She mentioned the creation of a commercial overlay to promote local business and to cut down on traffic. She also mentioned issues with density in the area that were being resolved. **Mr. Yarbro** asked **Mr. Plemel** about the availability of water for future growth. **Mr. Plemel** felt as if the city was in a unique position of having good water supply for future growth. The limited land base for development is more the concern. **Mr. Pulsipher** added that newer development is also more water efficient as well.

CARSON CITY CAPITOL COMPLEX PLAN

Pamela Wilcox, Administrator of State Lands, Ward Patrick, State Public Works Board

Ms. Wilcox provided background for the recent completion of the capital complex plan. She referred to it as a many headed monster with years of plans that have eventually morphed into the current plan. The plan calls for planning efforts for contiguous and isolated parcels alike with the core of the plan focusing on the capital complex itself. The outlying lands include; Stewart, the prisons and other isolated lands.

Ms. Wilcox explained how the first plan revolved around the capitol itself with 4 building anchoring it at the corners. In time many acquisitions and leases occurred around the city creating a more dispersed land use pattern. For the process three themes evolved; the need for agency growth as the population grew, an analysis of facilities and a move to keep only significant sites.

Mr. Ward Patrick from the Public Works Division added that the most recent update of the plan was in 2002. he said that the new building the group was in today was a result of the plan and that there is a desire to construct one new major building per decade to implement the plan itself. He mentioned the next building would be a human resources building adjacent to the Bryan Building (DCNR building). The funding for the structure is the major issue at this point. There was funding earmarked for building in the 05 session but at the end of session that money was funneled into other projects for the university system.

Mr. Patrick stated that there was a desire to continue the north south orientation of the complex with a turn westward at the Attorney General's building. The brick and mortar structures starting with the NDOT facility on South Stewart Street was to be continued with softscape integrated into the plans.

Ms. Eklund-Brown asked about the timeframe for the plan's implementation. **Ms. Wilcox** replied that it is a 20 year time frame. The newest arrangement is a lease-purchase option which is how the Bryan Building was developed. Agencies pay rent to a dummy corporation and when the lease expires the building will be owned in whole by the state. This option gave the state greater flexibility in financing the project. In fact the courts recently overturned past case law to allow this sort of arrangement to take place. **Ms. Wilcox** explained that there was wide range of opinions in the legislature on this issue. The bottom line was that agencies wanted to have services provided at locations closest to its clients. In many cases the best way to do that was to combine many related services into more central, larger locations.

Mr. Yarbrow asked if parking structures had been considered as part of the plan. **Ms. Wilcox** said the plan calls for surface parking first then as demands grows those lots would be converted to structured parking. **Mr. Conner** asked if underground parking was a possibility. **Ms. Wilcox** said that the water table in much of Eagle Valley would prohibit such structures. **Mr. Whitney** asked if the city was concerned about the amount of leased space in the city. **Ms. Wilcox** felt the state could never build itself out of leased space due to the pace of getting projects financed through the legislature. **Ms. Wilcox** went on by saying that the Interim Finance Committee received a request for demolition funds to remove the Kinkead Building which was recently evacuated over concerns it would not withstand an earthquake due its ongoing structural problems.

Pete Livermore arrived at 10:50 am to replace his alternate, Juan Guzman.

Mr. Whitney inquired with **Mr. Plemel** about the amount of available commercial space in Carson City. **Mr. Plemel** felt the city had considered state land use needs in current master plan revision. He also said that the city is encouraging redevelopment of certain areas and more mixed use areas where people can live work and shop. **Ms. Eklund-Brown** asked about how smart growth schemes have been working in Reno. **Mr. Whitney** said that with the recent addition of the Truckee River Whitewater Park in Reno and complimentary redevelopment along the water front that Reno is poised to continue its improvement in downtown. He said there were also multiple condo projects and that the market was responding to these newer housing options in the city.

HUMBOLDT TOIYABE FOREST PLAN UPDATE

Robert Vaught, Forest Supervisor Humboldt Toiyabe National Forest

Bob Vaught supervisor for the Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest presented an overview on current Forest Service planning activities on public lands. **Mr. Vaught** explained that he has been in the supervisor role for over 6 years and that there are many continuing challenges in managing the many uses on the forest. He explained how the Humboldt-Toiyabe was the largest national forest in the lower 48 states at 6.3 million acres. The forest comprises 8% of the state of Nevada. Approximately 87% of the Humboldt-Toiyabe is located in Nevada with the rest in California. He further explained that the forest is an ecosystem of higher elevation forests with 18 peaks over 10,000 feet. He said that the planning process was especially active in Carson, Washoe, Clark and Elko counties. **Mr. Vaught** offered to present at future SLUPAC meetings to keep the group informed.

Mr. Vaught explained that forest plans are to be updated every 10 years. The Humboldt-Toiyabe plan is even more challenging since two separate forest plans had to be integrated as the Humboldt and Toiyabe were joined years ago. He reminded the group that national rules govern how an update is to occur and that in recent years a change was sought for updating forest plans. The original plans listed all management issues and alternatives for each. Newer planning procedures allow for a more conflict avoidance approach to address issues directly with stakeholders while developing the plan rather than awaiting fallout after the plan was developed. The latter situation caused many plans to be enjoined in courts for years before implementation. The newer process was to create workable plans on the front end with the stakeholders to ensure the plans functionality and to reduce litigation.

Ms. Eklund-Brown emphasized the importance of counties to be directly involved in the process. **Mr. Vaught** concurred by saying that at this level of the planning process criteria is developed and cooperative agency status is available for counties. **Ms. Eklund-Brown** strongly encouraged other counties to get involved.

Mr. Conner asked if TRPA had any involvement in the plan. **Mr. Vaught** replied that it was not involved since it is considered a separate management unit and is managed out of the California office.

Mr. Vaught continued by saying that one of the major issues is the revisit of Wilderness designations. It had been decided that all wilderness issues must be resolved in this plan. He said that the 1989 Nevada Wilderness Act created over 1 million acres of wilderness statewide. New proposals for wilderness have been sent out for review with maps. He said they reflect the new criteria meeting the higher level of protection. **Ms. Eklund-Brown** asked if the new wilderness evaluation followed the old review of WSA's. **Mr. Vaught** said that the process was similar but the criteria varied. He explained that the multiple use concept continues.

Mr. Vaught said that 1.3 million acres of USFS lands appear to eligible for wilderness. The analysis for the lands included the presence of solitude, no roads, etc.. Criteria for wilderness was developed and reviewed against potential lands at the district office level then forwarded to the state office. There were two rounds of comments on the proposals and then the final recommendation is made. **Ms. Eklund-Brown** asked if all counties had submitted comments. He suggested they had received such comments. **Mr. Pulsipher** inquired about the maps availability. **Mr. Vaught** stated the map was being reviewed by state agencies before being disclosed to the counties for further review. **Mr. Higbee** suggested the group be careful about any expectations when it comes to new wilderness.

Mr. Mancebo stated that the counties needed total local support when it came to federal lands bills. He further mentioned that the 12K acre wilderness compromise was whittled down from 119K acres request by wilderness advocates. **Mr. Pulsipher** asked if there was language created regarding wilderness related to fuels management or existing roads that may be questionable in nature. **Mr. Vaught** responded that roads were carefully analyzed and cherry stemmed roads were identified for exclusion.

The next major topic **Mr. Vaught** presented was the Roadless area directive. He explained that as a result of coincident and past politics the roadless area policy was being developed as the Humboldt Toiyabe Forest Plan was gearing up. It has taken many years since the first policies were developed during the Clinton administration that these policies were finally being identified at the state level. He spoke of past roadless studies (RARE 1 and RARE 2) and how this would comprise 3 million acres of lands in the Humboldt-Toiyabe. Over half of the forest area is designated roadless and the policy would essentially prevent new roads from being developed. **Mr. Vaught** emphasized that this issue is major in the western states due to the active uses of ranching and mining and that many roads exist already.

He explained how the roadless rule could proceed in various forms. The first could be a petition from the Governor of a state directly to the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture for roadless areas. The second approach and most likely would be the ongoing review of roadless areas with a wait-and-see approach by the states as to the recommended policy development. He said that even though there is similarity in policy with the ongoing forest plan that it is distinct in its rules of conduct for policy development. He gave an example of how wide reaching the implications of such policy could be with a situation near Galena in Washoe County where roadless rules could complicate access in national forest lands adjacent to a major commuter highway between Lake Tahoe and Reno. Another example cited by **Mr. Vaught** as to the complications of roadless areas was the need for recreational improvements in the Spring Mountains near Pahrump but facing hurdles since it is roadless area.

Mr. Pulsipher again asked for clarification on the Roadless Rule policy development as being distinct from the Forest Revision process. **Mr. Whitney** inquired as to the level of local government oversight. **Mr. Vaught** explained their would be a decision from the Humboldt-Toiyabe on the issue. A petition could then be offered by the state based on the list of sites. Those sites would be adjudicated resulting in a final list. **Ms. Eklund-Brown** asked if there would be a review statewide and **Mr. Vaught** said there would be and that county support would be appreciated.

Mr. Vaught explained a section in the 1989 NV Wilderness Act that specifically stated roadless areas could not be used to create defacto wilderness. On the flipside **Mr. Vaught** stated that the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (NFMA) still required wilderness review upon forest plan revision. **Mr. Vaught** stated it was the US Forest Service's view that these two processes run separately on their own merits.

Another issue mentioned for review was related to range management. He said that the rescissions act section in NEPA required a review of all grazing allotments at the time of forest plan review. He said that with over 300 allotments in the Humboldt-Toiyabe there was ongoing research and review on these uses. It was not determined yet if an EA or full EIS would be required. The deadline for this review is 2010. He said the major questions for grazing allotments was whether or not grazing would continue on an allotment, what the standards for grazing would be working with the state department of agriculture to develop those standards.

Four other topics mentioned as part of the review would include;

- Fuels management
- Invasive species control
- Travel management
- Grazing and ranch uses

Within travel management the major forest concern is identifying appropriate locations for OHV use. This process has been ongoing for at least one year. There has been direct involvement with various stakeholder groups. All roads in a district are currently being reviewed for appropriateness for OHV travel. Off road use by OHV's will not be allowed. Concerns have been voiced by ranchers and others who need to use OHV's for their permitted uses. **Ms. Eklund-Brown** asked about the user groups and their willingness and ability to assist in the development of proper signage and management of roads. **Mr. Vaught** said that this occurred with regards to signage. **Mr. Mancebo** asked about the ability of OHV groups to do more self policing to help protect their use from the few that may threaten it. He felt there could be more user based responsibility for policing of rules.

Mr. Conner asked if the USFS had worked with BLM on connecting roads between jurisdictions. **Mr. Whitney** also asked if the two agencies could develop a similar signage system to avoid confusion among the public. **Mr. Vaught** said he would take note of these suggestions. **Mr. Guzman** explained how Carson City was able to work with the USFS to assure connectivity of trails between lands. **Mr. Livermore** stated that in the city master plan process there was a lot of consternation from residential users regarding the placement of OHV trails next to homes. **Mr. Pulsipher** added that keeping trails narrow with design elements would eliminate this potential problem. **Mr. Vaught** stressed that in roadless areas there would be common sense consideration such as the ability to pull-off the roadway to park or use an area. Once again the biggest concern

voiced from forest users were from miners and ranchers needing access to claims or allotments and that the agency was committed to working towards viable solutions for all parties.

NEVADA RURAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

Gary Longaker

Mr. Gary Longaker, Executive Director of the Nevada Rural Housing Authority gave a brief overview of the background of NVRHA. He recalled its history dating back to 1972 when it was created as a state agency. Throughout the years there have been many changes to its original charter. It now operates as a quasi-governmental agency with a non-profit status which enables it to obtain a variety of grant funding. Major changes occurred to the structure in 1995 and just recently in 2005. The organization now operates like a for profit business. Its funding is not tied to the Nevada legislative budget process.

Mr. Longaker profiled the organization by its better known section 8 housing voucher program and tenant based rental program for the elderly and disabled. In addition he described a host of newer programs that are lesser known and assist first time home buyers, assistance for workforce housing. Many of these new programs necessitate partnerships through various public and private groups which can range from the chamber of commerce who seek to maintain a variety of housing options to the state division of housing which host a variety of its own programs. Many of the NVRHA'S operate from Carson to Wells and south to Pahrump.

Mr. Longaker explained how there has been a recent effort to use technology and increase staff training to develop and implement programs. Its statewide housing element was recently contracted out to identify housing needs statewide. The plan provides guidance for both NVRHA and state and county governments interested in addressing housing needs.

Another program highlighted by **Mr. Longaker** was the Community Housing Development model where financial literacy programs are offered to prospective home buyers that may have challenges to gaining home ownership. Three Americorps volunteers have been staffing the program.

Mr. Longaker said that most demanded type of housing that is in critical need is entry level housing. His agency is seeking cooperation with multiple counties to leverage federal funds and bonding capabilities to create new housing options in many communities statewide that are unable to develop such options on their own. He said the type of development could include infill housing, redevelopment of areas or new developments. The current situation leads to the loss of funding for many counties who are unable to develop smaller projects. Since Nevada has a relatively low rural population the formula for this funding is skewed to where it is harder for states like Nevada to take advantage of such a program. **Mr. Longaker** explained that if many counties pooled their funds and funneled them through NVRHA then the funds would get used at a prorated level in each county housing developments and essentially be administered through NVRHA. He stated that there were reasonable income and mortgage levels limits assigned for all areas of the state to qualify.

Ms. Eklund-Brown asked if the funds were used now. **Mr. Longaker** said that it was really a bonding capacity and that no the capability has not been utilized by many counties. She further

inquired about the liability of the program. He stated that he did not believe there was any for the counties. Both **Mr. Whitney** and **Mr. Yarbrow** referred to current housing developments in their respective counties. **Mr. Longaker** stated the proposed concept was a different program altogether.

Mr. Pulsipher inquired if rural Clark County was able to take advantage of this program. **Mr. Longaker** replied that recent changes in the program would allow Clark County to receive such funding. **Mr. Livermore** commented that these housing programs are in great need in Carson City and that they come with other social needs of a community.

In closing **Mr. Longaker** said there was \$246 million in bonding capacity lost annually due to the difficulty in counties utilizing these housing funds. He offered his organizations' assistance in exploring these new housing options in future months through visits to county commissions statewide.

CITIZENS FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Ron Trunk, Executive Director

Ron Trunk, Executive Director for CAHI presented an overview of the non profit self housing group. He explained how the group had stated back in 1993 and had grown in mission and locale of projects. He stated that most projects thus far have been in either Lyon County, Carson City or Nye County. Recent interest and/or expansion of its housing developments has occurred in Fallon, Hawthorne, West Wendover and Lovelock. He mentioned the Autumn Village development which was slated for completion very soon. It was designed for both senior and disabled housing units with 98 units at \$276 rent per month. Another potential project is in Mineral County where 32 acres were acquired for a 57 unit development.

Mr. Trunk explained how they are supported through USDA Rural Development funds. The typically single family dwelling requires 1500 hrs from a host family at @35 hours /week for about 8 months. The time can be contributed by other family members if needed. This sweat equity allows for the subsidy of the home at a cost well below entry level housing costs. Of all the CAHI projects there has only been 1 foreclosure after built.

Ms. Eklund-Brown asked if it was possible to become upside down in one of these units. **Mr. Trunk** replied that it would not happen since the sweat equity allows for the housing unit to be priced much lower than any other comparable entry level housing unit.

Mr. Livermore asked about the ability to cover costs for utilities and other infrastructure. **Mr. Trunk** stated there were mechanisms to help subsidize those costs as well.

Mr. Yarbrow asked about how CAHI operated on the ground. **Mr. Trunk** said that they work as the general contractor having the sub-contractors do all the technical parts of the home like; HVAC, plumbing, electrical etc.. he also mentioned there has been some problems with speculators for the single family units but recent changes to the program have all but eliminated those loopholes.

Mr. Yarbrow asked if friends could help the host family. **Mr. Trunk** said they could and that the trained foreman on the job site ensure that people are tasked with appropriate skills and jobs.

Other programs highlighted by **Mr. Trunk** included weatherization and down payment assistance. He described a 7 county housing consortium in western Nevada that assists with these programs. **Mr. Pulsipher** expressed interest in CAHI's programs in Clark County. **Mr. Trunk** said that they have been developing a pilot program since last year for Clark County and that he could speak more to **Mr. Pulsipher** after the program. **Mr. Trunk** did emphasize the group is reaching out to new areas. **Ms. Wilcox** added that there is room in Nevada for more diverse housing options. **Mr. Trunk** said it was challenging to run the group, finding applicants and completing all the hurdles by the federal governments. **Mr. Trunk** recognized his talented staff for the accomplishments of the organization. He encouraged all counties to pass on suggestions for creating partnership with CAHI for future housing in their communities.

COUNTY PLANNING ISSUES

Chairman Mancebo asked for SLUPAC members to provide an update on their pertinent planning issues.

Varlin Higbee- Lincoln County

- Coyote Springs is ongoing- work in Clark County moving first
- Stream areas identified by orange fences
- Need for better coordination with Mesquite
- Water issues related to Mesquite and Coyote Spring being discussed
- Master Plan Update is ongoing
- Land Disposals as a result of the 2004 Lincoln County Land Bill

Robert Conner- Douglas County

- Updating Master plan (10 years old now)
- 16 community meetings to be held
- Consultant hired- Design Workshop
- Transportation update related to US 395
- Work on airport, facilities, transportation issues
- Slow Growth Initiative is on hold while parties plan strategy
- Move towards mixed use 25/75% commercial/residential

Michael Mears- Eureka County

- Barrick/Ruby Hill mines fully operational, limited housing in Eureka
- City annexed 8 years now being acted upon/need for planning assistance for policies
- Pressure mounting to expand Eureka
- Diamond Valley development proposal/ need for controlled growth/protect agriculture
- Eureka one of last counties without zoning/started to question this
- Molybdenum mine a possibility within 3-5 years, 300 employee potential
 - Prices are up, 2 ranches may sell land for mine, concerns over services
- Need to update master plan

Sheri Eklund-Brown- Elko County

Concern over Hill AFB expansion, third proposal set forth by base
Public Land Policy Plan with SLUPA is ongoing, expect completion in next few months
CNRWA- Central Nevada Rural Water Association-
Inventory being done of local water resources
Protests filed on over 60 water conveyances within the Humboldt Toiyabe NF
Rail Facility is still ongoing
Water rights, 10 applications filed for unallocated water rights by county
City/County annexation talks, possible sphere of influence to be created
West Wendover expansion into Utah appears to be dead.
Unresolved issues include east Wendover debt and operation/ownership of airfield.
Continued concern over grazing rights in northern Elko County/southern Idaho
Multi-city grant underway for improving EMS services in county
South Canyon Road- easement for now with USFS, debate over origination of roadway
County may try to prove the roadway was in place prior to national forest.
Oil exploration on the rise in county.

Mickey Yarbro- Lander County

Gene Ecthevery hired as county manager
Hwy 305/Broad Street improvements are ongoing
Sewer and water projects bids in at \$8.5 million
Kingston area is growing, need for more housing
Public Land Policy Plan adopted, being used by others for a template
Phoenix project is up and running

Roger Mancebo-Pershing County

Issue of 39 non-conforming land divisions in AMH being discussed for resolution by county.
County is working on its federal lands bill (checkerboard, disposals etc)-
Wilderness down to 12K acres from 199K
Much development interest in Lovelock
55 water rights applications filed by county

Glenn Bunch- Mineral County

Hawthorne is off BRAC list but still lingering effects-65 people laid off
Airport being upgraded for use
Master Plan review/update is almost finished
Infrastructure being address for future- water exists for 60K people, only 13K now
Storage of Mercury at Hawthorne-state is officially against

Bill Whitney, Washoe County

Train trench worked great in flood conditions
New trend in condo developments downtown
Granite Fox power plant by Semptra is faltering

Challenges with rural planning efforts adjacent city annexation desires

Pete Livermore-Carson City

Freeway opened to great fanfare
New state building (Bryan Bldg) completed and opened for business
Master Plan Update close to adoption
Flooding from New Years day resulted in \$5 million in damage
City to hire a trails planner based on new pathways plan
Tahoe Carson opened with heart surgery capabilities
Identifying sites for possible new community center- may involve partnership with state and WNCC
Presbyterian church restoration, expansion resolution one step closer
V and T railroad is being funded through new 1/8 cent sales tax
Sheep will be used on C-hill for cheatgrass removal
New public safety building in the works at \$12.5 million
New bus service rolled out (JAC)
Schulz Ranch SPA approved for 540 homes

Chuck Pulsipher- Clark County

Impact fees being considered for parks, roads and educations
3 affordable housing projects with BLM going very slowly
Ordinance being developed for moratorium on converting mobile home parks
County looking at alternative energy plans

PUBLIC COMMENT

Jim Petell (Town of Pahrump, Nye County Pubic Lands Advisory Commission) provided an overview of recent events of the Town of Pahrump.

Voiced condolences in the passing of Sheldon Bass, recent Nye County RPC/SLUPAC member.

Nye County Land Act ongoing

- 3400 acre land disposal proposal for Industrial, commercial possible housing
- Cleanup at 2 BLM sites, Veterans Park and shooting area
- 1500 acre park for biking hiking equestrian use (BLM)
- Veterans Cemetary, 320 acre parcel

Regional Planning Commission

- Concern over spot zoning
- Hard to attract new businesses
- Lowe's proposal in doubt

New regional hospital almost complete,

- no water or sewer connections yet.
- having difficulty getting contractors to finish job.

County recently approved 671,000 to complete the hard zoning and notification of the RPC area.

COUNCIL MEMBER COMMENTS

No further comments were made.

COUNCIL DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

There was no further discussion or recommendations made by the Council on any previous items that were presented.

FUTURE MEETING CONSIDERATIONS

- NDOT Blue Ribbon Highway Panel findings
- Affordable housing-BLM
- Ed James- regional efforts in Carson watershed
- Douglas County location offered by Mr. Conner
- Water importation projects
- FEMA update

ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 4:15 pm.

Clint Wertz, Senior Planner
Meeting Recorder

These minutes should be considered draft minutes pending their approval at a future meeting of the State Land Use Planning Advisory Council. Corrections and changes could be made before approval.

The meeting was digitally recorded in 2 files (morning afternoon). Anyone wishing to receive or review the recordings may call (775) 684-2731. The recordings will be retained for three years.